IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

JOE RUBEN MULLER,

Plaintiff,

v. Cause No. 1:16-cv-987

GEICO INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

GEICO General Insurance Company (hereinafter "GEICO"), improperly named as GEICO Insurance Company, by and through its counsel of record, Chapman and Charlebois, P.C., (Donna L. Chapman and Jessica C. Singer), hereby files this Notice of Removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441 and 1446, and in support thereof, states as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff Joe Ruben Muller ("Plaintiff") filed his Complaint to Recover Damages for Personal Injury Resulting from Automobile Accident and Bad Faith ("Complaint") in the First Judicial District, Santa Fe County, State of New Mexico, in Cause No. D-101-CV-2016-01463 (hereinafter "State Court Action") on June 20, 2016. (See Plaintiff's Complaint, attached hereto as Exhibit A).
- 2. In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges he was a resident of the State of New Mexico at the time of the collision. (*Id.* at ¶ 1).
- 3. Plaintiff named Defendant GEICO, as the only Defendant in Plaintiff's Complaint.
 - 4. Plaintiff does not make any allegations as to the citizenship of GEICO.

- 5. Plaintiff does not make any allegations as to the principal place of business of GEICO.
- 6. Defendant asserts GEICO is incorporated and its principal place of business is in the state of Maryland.
- 7. Diversity of citizenship is present in this matter as set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b)(2).
- 8. Defendant accepted service through the Superintendent of Insurance on August 5, 2016. (See Exhibit B).
- 9. Less than thirty (30) days have passed since Defendant accepted service of the initial pleadings on this matter.
- 10. As Defendant has accepted service and is the only Defendant served in this matter, 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(2)(A) is satisfied. (See Register of Actions for the State Court Action, hereto attached as Exhibit C).
- 11. Pursuant to Plaintiff's allegations, the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, as set forth in 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(b)(2).
- 12. Pursuant to the allegations in Plaintiff's Complaint, dated June 20, 2016, the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional amount of \$75,000. See also, Hanna v. Miller, 163 F. Supp. 2d 1302, 1305-06 (D.N.M. 2001). (Complaint ¶38, 39, 44, 45, 49, 50, 56 and the Wherefore paragraph). Plaintiff's Complaint seeks an award of punitive damages (Complaint ¶39 and the Wherefore paragraph.) While GEICO denies liability to Plaintiff for compensatory or punitive damages, Plaintiff's claim for punitive damages, could exceed the jurisdiction threshold for diversity jurisdiction. Alternatively, Plaintiff seeks an award of treble damages under the Unfair Practices Act. (Complaint ¶ 45).

Additionally, Plaintiff's Complaint seeks an award of attorney's fees pursuant to NMSA 1978, §39-2-1, NMSA §59A-16-20 and NMSA 1978, §57-12-10. (See Complaint, ¶ 38, 45, 50).

- citizenship, the amount in controversy must exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and cost. 28 U.S.C. §1332(a). Where a complaint does not contain dispositive allegations of the amount in controversy, the jurisdictional amount is determined by the allegations in the underlying complaint. See e.g., Laughlin v. Kmart Corp, 50 p.3d, 871, 873 (10 Cir. 1995). Calculations of the amount in controversy include both compensatory and punitive damages. See, e.g., Bell v. Preferred Life Assur. Soc'y 320 U.S. 238, 240 (1943); Watson v. Blakenship, 30 F.3d 383, 386 (10 Cir.1994). This calculation also includes attorney's fees. See Miera v. Dairyland Ins. Co., No. 96-0136-M, mem.Op. (D.N.M. Feb. 28, 1996)(denying remand of removed action based on availability of attorney's fees under New Mexico Unfair Claims Practice Act and Unfair Trade Practices Act. See also 14A Wright v. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure, §3712, at 176-78, and authorities cited therein; Foret v. Souther Farm Bureau Life Ins. Co., 918 F. 2d 534, 537 (5 Cir. 1990). The calculation also includes treble damages claims.
- 14. In addition to actual damages in this case, Plaintiff is requesting attorney fees and costs, exemplary and punitive damages. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff will likely seek in excess of \$50,000 in attorney's fees through the trial of this matter.
- 15. This case may be removed to this Court by Defendant pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(b) and 1446.

- 16. By and through this Notice of Removal, Defendant removes all claims asserted against it on the basis of diversity jurisdiction, which is conferred upon this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1441.
- 17. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), written notice of the filing of this Notice of Removal is being concurrently served upon the Plaintiff on this date.
- 18. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), Defendant is concurrently filing a Notice of Filing of Removal in the State Court Action, a copy of which is hereto attached as Exhibit D.
- 19. In addition to the Notice of Filing Notice of Removal in the State Court Action,
 Defendant is concurrently filing an Entry of Appearance in the State Court Action on this
 date, a copy of which is hereto attached as Exhibit E.
- 20. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a) and D.N.M.LR-Civ. 81.1(a), all process, pleadings, and orders from the State Court Action will be filed with this Court in a separate Transmittal of State Court Record within twenty-eight days (28) of this Notice.
 - 21. A Civil Cover Sheet for this Court is hereto attached as Exhibit F.

WHEREFORE, the removing Defendant gives notice the above-styled action,

which was pending in the First Judicial District, Santa Fe County, State of New Mexico, as Cause No. D-202-CV-2016-01463 is removed to this Court.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAPMAN AND CHARLEBOIS, P.C.

/s/Jessica C. Singer

Donna L. Chapman
Jessica C. Singer
P.O. Box 92438
Albuquerque, NM 87199
505-242-6000
donna@cclawnm.com
jessica@cclawnm.com
Attorneys for Defendant

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 2nd day of September, 2016, I filed the foregoing electronically through CM/ECF system, which caused the following parties or counsel to be served by electronic means, as more fully reflected on the Notice of Electronic Filing:

Matthew J. Zamora
Carter & Valle Law Firm, P.C.
8012 Pennsylvania Circle NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
mz@carterlawfirm.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

/s/Jessica C. Singer
Jessica C. Singer

DISTRICT COURT CLEI 6/20/2016 5:05:03 F STEPHEN T. PACHEC Maureen Narai

STATE OF NEW MEXICO COUNTY OF SANTA FE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

JOE RUBEN MULLER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Cause No. D-101-CV-2016-01463 Case assigned to Singleton, Sarah

GEICO INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT FOR BAD FAITH AND RELATED CAUSES OF ACTION

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, Joe Ruben Muller, by and through his counsel of record, CARTER & VALLE LAW FIRM, PC (Matthew J. Zamora, Esq.), and for his Complaint against Defendant, Geico Insurance Company ("Geico"), hereby states as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff, Joe Ruben Muller, is an individual who resides in Bernalillo County, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- 2. Upon information and belief, Defendant Geico is a foreign insurer doing business in New Mexico.
- 3. Pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 59A-5-31, the New Mexico Superintendent of Insurance has been appointed as Defendant's agent for service of process in this matter, and thus venue in this Court is proper.
 - 4. This Court has jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter herein.
- 5. On June 23, 2011, Plaintiff stopped for a red light at the intersection of Paseo Del Norte Blvd., NE and San Pedro, NE in Albuquerque, New Mexico.
 - 6. At that time, the tortfeasor crashed into the rear of Plaintiff's vehicle.
 - 7. Plaintiff did not cause or in any way contribute to the auto crash.
 - 8. Plaintiff was injured in the auto crash.



Page 1 of 7

- 9. Plaintiff sought medical treatment for his injuries after the crash.
- 10. Plaintiff had his own insurance coverage with Defendant Geico for Medical Payments (MedPay) coverage.
 - 11. Plaintiff complied with all contractual obligations for his MedPay coverage.
- 12. Defendant Geico refused to pay the full qualifying amount of Plaintiff's MedPay claim.
- 13. On September 24, 2011, Plaintiff sent a letter of representation to Geico along with copies of receipts for co-pays for reimbursement under the medical payment provision of the policy, with medical documentation regarding his treatment to follow.
- 14. On October 26, 2011, Plaintiff followed up with Defendant Geico because payment was not received.
- 15. On November 1, 2011, Plaintiff responded to correspondence from Geico denying reimbursement and requested a copy of the pertinent part of the policy used in denying this claim.
- 16. On November 30, 2011, Plaintiff followed up on the November 1, 2011 correspondence and enclosed a signed medical records authorization release.
- 17. On December 16, 2011, Plaintiff followed up on the November 30, 2011 correspondence.
- 18. On December 22, 2011, Plaintiff followed up with Defendant Geico regarding his claim.
- 19. On January 3, 2012, Plaintiff questioned Geico on the reimbursement process and it had started over.
- 20. On January 13, 2012, Plaintiff responded to Geico's correspondence wherein Defendant identifies their right to reimbursements for a claim that had not been paid. A second January 13, 2012 correspondence again questioned the length of the payment process.

- 21. On February 29, 2012, Plaintiff inquired on payments and requests arbitration.
- 22. On March 7, 2012, Plaintiff responds to Defendant Geico's letter wherein Geico agrees to pay towards \$120.00 co-pays, but no additional payments until billing and treatment received from Plaintiff.
- 23. On March 9, 2012 Plaintiff responds to Geico's correspondence that documentation by medical providers is inadequate to issue payment and plaintiff again requests an arbitrator.
- 24. From March 9, 2012 until August 10, 2015 multiple letters were exchanged between the parties.
 - 25. On August 6, 2015, Geico provided a check to Plaintiff in the sum of \$6,970.28.

COUNT I - INSURANCE BAD FAITH

- 26. Plaintiff incorporates all prior allegations as if set forth herein in full.
- 27. There is implied in every insurance policy a duty on the part of the insurance company to deal fairly with the policy holder, including insureds.
 - 28. Defendant Geico, not Plaintiff, drafts its insurance contracts.
- 29. Fair dealing means to act honestly and in good faith in the performance of the contract.
- 30. The insurance company must give equal consideration to its own interests and the interests of the insured.
- 31. An insurance company and its employees act in bad faith when they refuse to timely pay a claim of the insured for reasons which are frivolous or unfounded.
- 32. Defendant Geico's decision refusing to timely pay full qualifying medical payments benefits was frivolous.

- 33. In deciding whether to pay a claim, the insurance company and its employees must act reasonably under the circumstances to conduct a timely and fair investigation and evaluation of the claim.
- 34. An insurer and its employees and agents may not unreasonably delay notification to the insured that the claim will be paid or denied.
- 35. A failure to timely investigate, evaluate, and pay a claim is a bad faith breach of the duty to act honestly and in good faith in the performance of the insurance contract.
- 36. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Geico as enumerated above constitute a breach of their duty of good faith to Plaintiff.
- 37. As a result of the bad faith of Defendant Geico, Plaintiff has suffered damages, and seeks compensatory damages in a monetary amount to be determined at trial.
- 38. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Geico as enumerated above, constitute an unreasonable failure to pay a first party coverage claim, and/or an unreasonable investigation of a first party insurance claim entitling Plaintiff to an award of reasonable attorney fees and costs pursuant to NMSA 1978, §39-2-1.
- 39. The actions of Defendant Geico were malicious, willful, reckless, wanton, oppressive, in bad faith and/or fraudulent, entitling Plaintiff to recover punitive damages in an amount to be determined.

COUNT II-UNFAIR INSURANCE PRACTICES UNDER NMSA 1978, § 59A-16-20

- 40. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the foregoing allegations of the Complaint as if fully set forth below.
- 41. The acts and failures to act of Defendant, as enumerated above, constitute unfair claims practices which are prohibited pursuant to the New Mexico Unfair Insurance Claims Practices Act, NMSA 1978, § 59A-16-20.

- 42. Defendant, as set forth above, knowingly and willfully, or with such frequency as to indicate its general business practice in this State, engaged in unfair insurance claims practices prohibited by NMSA 1978, Section 59A-5-26(C)(2)(a) and (b), where Defendant:
 - (a) has without just cause failed to pay, or delayed payment of, claims arising under its policies, whether the claim is in favor of an insured or in favor of a third person with respect to the liability of an insured to such third person; or
 - (b) without just cause compels insureds or claimants to accept less than amount due them or to employ attorney or to bring suit against the insurer or such an insured to secure full payment or settlement of a claim.
- 43. Defendant acts in such a way to delay and deter the payment of claims with such frequency as to indicate that such conduct is Defendant's general business practice.
- 44. As a direct and proximate result of the unfair claims practices of Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered compensatory damages, incidental damages and consequential damages in a monetary amount to be determined at trial.
 - 45. Plaintiff is also entitled to an award of attorney fees and costs under the statute.

COUNT III-BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 46. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the foregoing allegations of the Complaint as if fully set forth below.
- 47. Defendant Geico's acts and failures to act, as enumerated above constitute a willful breach of its contract with Plaintiff.
 - 48. Plaintiff performed all conditions precedent to the contract with Defendant Geico.
- 49. As a result of the breach of the contract by Defendant Geico, Plaintiff has suffered monetary damages necessary to restore her to which was lost by Defendant Geico's breach, including but not limited to incidental damages, consequential damages and reliance damages,

attorney fees and costs and any other damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

50. Defendant Geico's acts and failures to act, as enumerated above, constitute an unreasonable failure to pay a first party coverage claim, entitling Plaintiff to an award of reasonable attorney fees and costs pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 39-2-1.

COUNT IV-BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

- 51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior allegations as if set forth herein in full.
- 52. Defendant's duties to Plaintiff were non-delegable duties, such that Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for each and every violation of these duties, whether committed directly by Defendant or by any of its attorneys, employees or agents.
- 53. There is implied in every insurance policy a duty on the part of the insurance company to deal fairly with the policy holder and insureds like Plaintiff.
- 54. When Plaintiff made claims under his MedPay coverage for injuries received in the motor vehicle crash, Defendant breached its duty to act in good faith under the covenant of good faith and fair dealing inherent in every insurance contract by putting its interests above the interests of its insured.
- 55. Defendants put their interests above their insured by intentionally, knowingly, willfully and recklessly delaying payment of a MedPay claim.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach of fiduciary duty, Plaintiff has been injured in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant Geico for all compensatory damages; damages for bad faith; damages for unfair insurance practices; damages for breach of contract; punitive damages; statutory damages, costs, fees and interest as allowed by law, and for such other relief as this honorable Court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted,

CARTER & VALLE LAW FIRM, PC

/s/ Matthew J. Zamora
MATTHEW J. ZAMORA, ESQ.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
8012 Pennsylvania Circle, N.E.
Albuquerque, NM 87110
PH: 505-888-4357

D169433190101142 Calun ECF

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF INSURANCE

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 1689, Santa Fe, NM 87504-1689 Physical Address: 1120 Paseo de Peralta, Room 428, Santa Fe, NM 87501

Main Phone: (505) 827-4601; Main Fax (505) 827-4734; Toll Free: 1-855-4-ASK-OSI www.osi.state.nm.us

SUPERINTENDENT OF INSURANCE

John G. Franchini - (505) 827-4299

Service of Process Room 432 (505) 827-4241

DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT

Robert Doucette - (505) 827-4439

August 5, 2016

GEICO General Insurance Co. Legal Dept. – Matthew J Zuraw 2280 North Greenville Ave Richardson, TX 75082

Re: Joe Ruben Muller Vs GEICO Insurance Company, D101CV2016-01463

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with the provisions of NMSA 1978, Sections 59A-5-31 & 59A-32, enclosed is a copy of a Summons, Complaint for Bad Faith and Related Causes of Action, Plaintiff's First Set of Discovery to Defendant GEICO Insurance Company, to Defendant GEICO Insurance Company in the State of New Mexico on the above styled cause, Service has been accepted on your behalf as of August 5, 2016.

Respectfully,

John G. Franchini, Superintendent

Enclosure

CERTIFIED MAIL 7010 0290 0002 3835 6518

EXHIBIT 8

Case 1:16-cv-00987-KBM-KK Document 1 Filed 09/02/16 Page 14 of 19age 1 of 1

Skip to Main Content Logout My Account Search Menu New Civil Probate Family Search Refine Search Back

Location : Santa Fe County Images Help

REGISTER OF ACTIONS

Case No. D-101-CV-2016-01463

Joe Ruben Muller v. Geico Insurance Company

 $\omega \omega \omega \omega \omega \omega \omega$

Case Type: Tort 06/20/2016 Date Filed: Location: Santa Fe County Judicial Officer: Singleton, Sarah

PARTY INFORMATION

Defendant Geico Insurance Company Attorneys

Plaintiff Muller, Joe Ruben

Matthew J. Zamora Retained 505-888-4357(W)

EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT

OTHER EVENTS AND HEARINGS

Cause Of Actions 06/20/2016 Bad Faith (Count I - Insurance Bad Faith)

Action Type Action 06/20/2016

Cause Of Actions Trade Practices Act (Count II - Unfair Insurance Practices Under NMSA 1978, Section 59A-16-20) Action Type Action

06/20/2016 Cause Of Actions Breach of Contract (Count III)

Action Type Action

06/20/2016 **Cause Of Actions** Bad Faith (Count IV - Breach of Fiduciary Duty)

Action Type 06/20/2016 OPN: COMPLAINT

Complaint for Bad Faith and Related Causes of Action

08/02/2016 SUMMONS ISSUED

Summons Issued to Geico Insurance Company

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Plaintiff Muller, Joe Ruben Total Financial Assessment

132.00 Total Payments and Credits 132.00 Balance Due as of 08/31/2016 0.00

06/21/2016

06/21/2016 Transaction Assessment 132.00 File & Serve Payment Receipt # SFED-2016-6316 Muller, Joe Ruben (132.00)



STATE OF NEW MEXICO COUNTY OF SANTA FE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

JOE RUBEN MULLER,

Plaintiff.

٧.

No. D-101-CV-2016-01463

GEICO INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

NOTICE OF FILING OF REMOVAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that GEICO General Insurance Company (hereinafter "GEICO"), improperly named as GEICO Insurance Company, by and through its attorneys Chapman and Charlebois, P.C. (Donna L. Chapman and Jessica C. Singer), has filed a Notice of Removal in the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico. A true and correct copy of the Notice of Removal, attached to this Notice as Exhibit "1" was sent via email to:

Matthew J. Zamora
Carter & Valle Law Firm, P.C.
8012 Pennsylvania Circle NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
mz@carterlawfirm.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

Respectfully submitted,

CHAPMAN AND CHARLEBOIS, P.C.

Donna L Chapman
Jessica C. Singer
P.O. Box 92438
Albuquerque, NM 87199
Tel: (505) 242-6000
donna@cclawnm.com
jessica@cclawnm.com
Attorneys for GEICO



I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT on this _____ day of September, 2016, I filed the foregoing electronically through the Odyssey File and Serve system, which caused the following counsel of record to be served by electronic means, as more fully reflected on the Notice of Electronic Filing, and that a copy was sent via e-mail to the following:

Matthew J. Zamora
Carter & Valle Law Firm, P.C.
8012 Pennsylvania Circle NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
mz@carterlawfirm.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

Jessica C Singer

STATE OF NEW MEXICO COUNTY OF SANTA FE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

JOE RUBEN MULLER,

Plaintiff,

٧.

No. D-101-CV-2016-01463

GEICO INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

ENTRY OF APPEARANCE

Chapman and Charlebois, P.C. (Donna L. Chapman and Jessica C. Singer), hereby enter their appearance on behalf of Defendant GEICO General Insurance (hereinafter "GEICO"), improperly named as GEICO Insurance Company. Copies of all documents pertaining to litigation in this matter should be sent to the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAPMAN AND CHARLEBOIS, P.C.

Donna L. Chapman Jessica C. Singer PO Box 92438 Albuquerque, NM 87199 505-242-6000 donna@cclawnm.com jessica@cclawnm.com

Attorneys for GEICO



I hereby certify the foregoing was served on the following counsel of record via the Odyssey File & Serve system on this 200 day of September, 2016:

Matthew J. Zamora
Carter & Valle Law Firm, P.C.
8012 Pennsylvania Circle NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
mz@carterlawfirm.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

Jessica C. Singer

Case 1:16-cv-00987-KBM-KK Document 1 Filed 09/02/16 Page 19 of 19

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The IS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS JOE RUBEN MULLER			Artificial - Artificial Artificia	DEFENDANTS GEICO GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Santa Fe (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Matthew J. Zamora, Carter & Valle Law Firm, P.C. 8012 Pennsylvania Circle NE, Alb. NM 87110 505-888-4357				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known) Donna L. Chapman & Jessica C. Singer Chapman and Charlebois, P.C. PO Box 92438, Alb. NM 87198 505-242-6000		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. Cr			(Place on "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	U.S. Governmen		((For Diversity Cases Only) P	PTF DEF I 1 Incorporated or F of Business In	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Principal Place
Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens	hip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	J 2	Principal Place
					3 G 3 Foreign Nation	0606
IV. NATURE OF SUI	(Place an "X" in One Box C	inly)	L For	eign Country	Service and the service of the service and the service of the serv	
CONTRACT		ORTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR PROBLEM INJUR 365 Personal lajury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability BERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 533 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -	TY	Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Lesve Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 FROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES OTHER STATUTES A10 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in ☐ 1 Original ■ 2 Rer		Conditions of Confinement				
		Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reinst Reope		rred from	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO			filing (Do	not cite jurisdictional stati	utes unless diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R. Cv.P.				MAND S	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 912/10 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF A TO	DRNEY OF	RECORD		
	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUD	oge